

#19

|                          |                                      |                                   |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.<br><b>09/599,213</b> | Applicant(s)<br><b>Wong et al</b> |  |
|                          | Examiner<br><b>William Jarvis</b>    | Group Art Unit<br><b>1614</b>     |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William Jarvis (3) Dr. James Napoli

(2) Dr. Stephen Arneric (4) Mr. Sandip Patel

Date of Interview Feb 19, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:  
Document on computer showing the unexpected selectivity of S,S-reboxetine for norepinephrine reuptake as compared to binding to serotonin and other receptors

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:  
references cited in the rejection


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  
Applicant's attorneys and research specialist pointed out the unexpected selectivity of S,S-reboxetine for norepinephrine reuptake compared to other common receptors. Applicant will file a declaration showing these unexpected results. After consultation with SPE Seidel, it is acceptable for applicant to define "chronic pain" in the application with a widely accepted definition (e.g. Stedman's Medical Dictionary or the Merck Manual). This issue of scope of enablement with respect to claim 1 was discussed and will be addressed in the declaration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

  
 WILLIAM R. A. JARVIS  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

ART UNIT 1614